

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 EDGAR SOLIS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA; and
15 MICHAEL BELL,

16 Defendants.

17 Case No.: 5:23-cv-00515-HDV-JPR

18 [Honorable Hernán D. Vera]
19 Magistrate Judge Jean P. Rosenbluth

20 **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE
No. 3 TO EXCLUDE
SPECULATIVE AND
UNREASONABLE SUBJECTIVE
FEARS**

21 **Hearing on Motions in Limine:**

22 October 1, 2024 at 09:00 a.m.

23 **Final Pretrial Conference:**

24 October 8, 2024 at 10:00 a.m.

25 **Jury Trial**

26 October 29, 2024 at 09:00 a.m.

27 Ctrm: 10D

28

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 Having reviewed Plaintiff's Motion *in Limine* No. 3 to Exclude Speculative
3 Beliefs and Unreasonable Subjective Fears, and GOOD CAUSE appearing therein,
4 Plaintiff's Motion is HEREBY GRANTED that it is excluded from evidence,
5 testimony, argument, or reference at trial any information related to the following:

6 a) Whether Plaintiff was fleeing from a felony that threatened death or
7 serious bodily injury. The Court finds that there is no evidence that Plaintiff was
8 fleeing from a felony that threatened death or serious bodily injury.

9 b) Whether some unknown bystander in some unknown location would
10 potentially be threatened at some unknown time in the future. Given that Defendant
11 Officer Bell did not see any bystander and did not know of the location of any
12 bystander, and did not know of any threat to an unknown bystander by Plaintiff, that
13 Plaintiff had not attempted to harm any bystander or attempt to go into any door or
14 window, any inference of a threatened bystander is excluded.

15
16 The basis for this order is that information specified herein is irrelevant to
17 liability and damages, and/or unknown to Defendant Officer Bell; or otherwise any
18 probative value is substantially outweighed by the risk of unfair prejudice,
19 confusing the issues, wasting time, and misleading the jury; this information
20 constitutes improper character evidence; would call for speculation; and would be a
21 produce of improper opinion. Federal Rules of Evidence, Rules 401, 403, 404, 602,
22 701, 702; *Glenn v. Washington Cnty.*, 673 F.3d 864, 873 (9th Cir. 2011).

23
24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25
26 DATED: _____

27
28 Honorable Hernán D. Vera
United States District Judge